

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-11 and 20-25 are pending in this application, of which claims 1-6 and 20-25 have been amended. Claims 12-19 have been canceled. No new claims have been added.

Claims 1, 2 and 4-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by **Tsang et al.** (previously applied), or in the alternative under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as “obvious in view of the well-known practice of making individual components integral.”

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 1 and 4 have been amended to clarify the structure of the ramp member and the rectifier plates in relation to front and rear surfaces of the recording medium. Claim 1, as amended, recites a recording medium including first and second surfaces, and claim 4, as amended, recites a ramp member including first and second surfaces. Both claim 1 and claim 4 recite that the second surface is reverse to the first surface. Claim 1 further defines first and second head sliders, a head actuator, and a ramp member including first and second ramps. The first ramp is designed to receive one of the tip ends of the head actuator so as to position the first head slider at a position spaced from the recording medium. The second ramp is designed to receive another of the tip ends of the head actuator so as to position the second head slider at a position spaced from the recording medium. Claims 1 and 4, as amended, further define first and second rectifier plates formed on the ramp member. The first rectifier plate is opposed to the first surface of the recording medium at a distance. The second rectifier plate is opposed to the second surface of the recording medium at a distance. Further, the ramp member and the first

and second rectifier plates are made into one piece.

Generally, front and rear surfaces of the recording medium, such as a magnetic recording disk, are utilized for recordation of data. If the recording medium is driven, airflow is generated along the front surface of the recording medium. Likewise, airflow is generated along the rear surface of the recording medium. When rectifier components are incorporated into the recording medium drive in order to suppress turbulence of the airflow on both surfaces of the recording medium, assembly of the recording medium drive becomes complicated. According to the structure defined in claims 1 and 4, as amended, the ramp member and the first and second rectifier plates can be handled as a one-piece component. The conventional assembling technique of a recording medium drive can be applied to the recording medium drive of claim 1. Assembly of the recording medium drive can ultimately remain uncomplicated, irrespective of the addition of first and second rectifier plates. The recording medium drive can thus be efficiently manufactured.

On the other hand, the second extensions of Tsang et al. can be rotated with respect to base 102. Second extensions 830 and ramp member 880 are not made into one piece. Assembly of the recording medium drive of Tsang et al. cannot be prevented from becoming excessively complicated. Tsang et al. fails to disclose or suggest a one-piece component including a ramp member and rectifier plates for efficient manufacture of the recording medium drive.

Thus, the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and/or 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections should be withdrawn.

Claims 20-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Tsang et al. as applied above, and further in view that official notice is taken of the well accepted practices of fabricating components per the processes of molding, insert molding, etc.

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 20-22 depend from claim 1, and claims 23-25 depend from claim 4. Both claims 1 and 4 have been amended to be allowable over the applied art, and claims 20-25 should also be allowable, and the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 3 and 6-11 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but the Examiner has indicated that these claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Accordingly, claim 3 has been so amended, except without the limitations of claim 2, from which it presently depends.

Similarly, claim 6 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 4, but without the limitations of claim 5, from which it depends. Claims 7-11 depend from claim 6.

In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, claims 1-11 and 20-25, as amended, are in condition for allowance, which action, at an early date, is requested.

If, for any reason, it is felt that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

U.S. Patent Application Serial No. **10/716,883**  
Response to Office Action dated December 8, 2006

In the event that this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fees for such an extension of time and any other fees which may be due with respect to this paper, to Deposit Account No. 01-2340.

Respectfully submitted,

ARMSTRONG, KRATZ, QUINTOS,  
HANSON & BROOKS, LLP



William L. Brooks

Attorney for Applicant

Reg. No. 34,129

WLB/ak

Atty. Docket No. **031283**

Suite 1000

1725 K Street, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20006

(202) 659-2930



**23850**

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

Enclosures: Amendment Transmittal  
Check in the amount of \$200.00

Q:\HOME\AKERR\WLB\03\031283\amendment feb 2007